

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN**

---

Floyd Hantz,	:	
	:	Civil Action No.: 1:14-cv-1287
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	
Synchrony Bank f/k/a GE Capital Retail Bank;	:	
and DOES 1-10, inclusive,	:	<b>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</b>
Defendants.	:	
	:	

---

**COMPLAINT & JURY DEMAND**

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Floyd Hantz, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

**JURISDICTION**

1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* ("TCPA").

2. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

**PARTIES**

3. The Plaintiff, Floyd Hantz ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Battle Creek, Michigan, and is a "person" as the term is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

4. Defendant Synchrony Bank f/k/a GE Capital Retail Bank ("Synchrony"), is an Ohio business entity with an address of 950 Forrer Boulevard, Kettering, Ohio 45420, and is a "person" as the term is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

5. Does 1-10 (the “Agents”) are individual agents employed by Synchrony and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Agents may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

6. Synchrony at all times acted by and through one or more of the Agents.

**FACTS**

7. Within the last year, Synchrony contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a consumer debt allegedly owed by Plaintiff.

8. At all times mentioned herein, Synchrony called Plaintiff’s cellular telephone, number 269-xxx-0084, by using an automated telephone dialer system (“ATDS”) and an artificial or prerecorded voice.

9. When Plaintiff answered calls from Synchrony, he was met with a prerecorded message stating that the call was from Synchrony with an important business matter.

10. During a live conversation with Synchrony in or around October, 2014, Plaintiff demanded that all communication to his cellular telephone number cease.

11. Despite the foregoing, Synchrony continued to call Plaintiff at an annoying and harassing rate, making up to 5 calls per day.

**COUNT I**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT –**  
**47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.**

12. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

13. Without consent Synchrony contacted the Plaintiff by means of automatic telephone calls and prerecorded messages at a cellular telephone in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

14. Synchrony continued to place automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone after knowing there was no consent to continue the calls. As such, each call placed to Plaintiff was made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, and subject to treble damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

15. The telephone number called by Synchrony was assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs charges for incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

16. The calls from Synchrony to Plaintiff were not placed for "emergency purposes" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i).

17. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each call made in negligent violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

18. As a result of each call made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of treble damages in an amount up to \$1,500.00 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants:

1. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each violation determined to be negligent pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
2. Treble damages for each violation determined to be willful and/or knowing pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C);
3. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

**TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS**

Dated: December 16, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Sergei Lemberg, Esq.  
Attorney for Plaintiff Floyd Hantz  
LEMBERG LAW, L.L.C.  
1100 Summer Street  
Stamford, CT 06905  
Telephone: (203) 653-2250  
Facsimile: (888) 953-6237  
Email: slembert@lembertlaw.com